

artificial light from said artificial light source outwardly from said lighting fixture and into said building.

REMARKS:

Claims 1 through 20 remain standing for prosecution in this patent application.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as they are considered informal. Applicant submits herewith good quality formal drawings.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 16 because of a typographical error on line 4 of the Claim. This error has been corrected.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 1-12, 15-16, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,113,728 to Boyd. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of these claims as being anticipated by the Boyd patent. The Examiner states that Boyd teaches a lighting fixture 10 that comprises a main frame body 14 as can be seen in the figures, the main frame 14 is merely one or two panels in the overall lighting fixture 10. In claim 1 as presently on file, there is a limitation of: "a light transmissive skylight mounted in generally overlying relation on said main frame body;". Applicant submits that in the Boyd patent, there is no light transmissive skylight mounted in generally overlying relation over the main frame body 14. Accordingly, the Boyd patent cannot anticipate claim 1.

In claim 20 as presently on file, there is a limitation of: "In seriatim, a light transmissive skylight, a main frame body, a reflector means, and a first light socket for receiving an artificial light source therein;". Applicant submits an argument similar to that made above, in that in the Boyd patent, there is no light transmissive skylight in seriatim with the main frame body.

Applicant therefore submits that the Examiner's rejection of the independent claims, 1-4, 1-12, 15-16, 18 and 20 has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 3,113,728 to Boyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,733,505 to VanDame. Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejection of the dependent claims 5 - 10 which depend from claim 1 is now moot in light of the fact that the independent claims 1 is not anticipated by the Boyd patent.

If it would help in the prosecution of the present patent application, Applicant invites the Examiner to call collect at the above telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Chimanlal N. Gandhi